

IMAC QA Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

March 22, 2004

Members Present: John Haine, Bernadette Connolly, Lisa Hanson, Pam Lohaus, Marcia Williamson, Marilyn Rudd, Vicki Jessup, Rick Zynda, DHFS; Kathy Judd, Chris Elms, Dane County; Jackie Bennett, Racine County

Via Conference Call: Joanne Ator, Door County; Lorie Mueller, La Crosse County; Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee County

Members Absent: None

1. February 23, 2004 Minutes

The February minutes were reviewed. No changes or corrections - minutes approved as written.

2. Continuing Discussion Regarding Error Type Designation and Penalty Pass-Through Guidelines:

The timeline for inclusion of guidelines in the 2005 agency contracts is as follows:

April 6th - IM Managers Meeting to discuss and send on to IMAC Committee.

June- IMAC will consider

Mid- August- final submission to Mark Moody, Division Administrator

Because of the Reduced Reporting rules for Food Stamps there are fewer “client errors” found, and a proportionately higher percentage of the total dollars in error are “agency preventable” errors. The absolute total dollars in error overall is decreasing, as is the overall error rate.

The state sanction in 2002 was calculated at 3.5 million. The same errors and rate under the new federal method of calculating in 2004 would be about 1 million.

WCHSSA agrees that all agencies should assume some part of the liability for FS errors on active cases. At this time there are no penalties assessed to local agencies for other things being measured, such as negative rates (terminations and denials), and timeliness. The latter are all measured for bonuses.

A VISION presentation was made to IMAC. In brief, (1) each function in a program is “costed out,” and becomes part of the POS contract. (Purchase of Services). (2) Funding is share at a proportionate level. See our minutes of Feb. 23rd, page 12, item F. Parts of this VISION idea may be used by the department.

There was continuing discussion on having all the counties share in the sanctions, even those who were not included in the sample. All 62 Colorado counties all share the sanction as well as bonus money regardless of individual agency performance. Other comments are that some

Wisconsin counties do not include county levy money to help pay for IM expenses as needed, and some do. Per Jacaie, Milwaukee County is one where there is none and if there is sanction that cannot be paid ES would be laid off.

However, the final conclusion of this group is to **uphold the previous recommendations** that were made to IMAC in June 2003, which is that all counties that were included in the State QC sample for the fiscal year would share in sanctions. The bonus money if awarded to Wisconsin would be shared with those counties included in the sample. The state would also pay part of the sanction as well as share in the bonus. There would be caps on the sanctions—a percentage of the IM allocation of each agency. Previously this committee recommended between 2% and 4% of the total allocation.

The group also agreed to keep the APE designation for the time being. Only agencies with APE errors would be paying sanctions. Details of the previously agreed-upon recommendations will be sent along with these minutes by John.

These recommendations would be sent to the Workload/ Finance Committee who is considering all these issues.

3. MA Review Process:

The 2004 QAP's will require a small number of MA reviews, with the data entered into a database that the state will create. Some agencies have already been doing cases using their own sample and emphasis. Jackie suggested they be allowed to enter those cases already done into the data base being created. DHFS is very interested in those findings but may prefer to get them transmitted in format other than adding them to the database of cases that will be pulled for sampling. The reason is that the pulled sample would be statistically valid, but the other cases would be selected and targeted differently. This program is supposed to be in place April 1, 2004, but the requested sample creation has not been done yet.

There is no sanction passed through on MA cases.

The state's emphasis in 2004 is EBD Medicaid.

Jacaie suggested that even more helpful than the handful of targeted cases, might be reports to ID discrepancies of certain MA groups. That could be more efficient in finding and fixing cases. Vicki agreed that automated reports can be helpful, and says there is also discussion in progress for Data Exchange disposition enhancement. It can give an idea of what savings there are for completing DX on cases.

4. Quality Assurance Plans:

The QAP's were due February 26th. There are some outstanding, but some are still being reviewed by the AAA's. Marilyn created a chart with all the local agencies listed, their 2003 FS error rates, number of QC's in the state's sample, and then various items that were found in their proposed QAP, such as number FS cases they plan to review, whether it's targeted or not, MA review plans, customer service surveys, other items mentioned.

The group agreed that the document, once more complete, could be helpful if sent to all agencies, so they can get an idea of what others are doing or including in their plans. It was advised that the county name could be left off. The question was posed, how inclusive should the QAP's be? Do we change the contract language to be more extensive, to include outreach,

security, fraud plans, customer service plans? Some of this is also in the MER. The group liked the concept of the QAP's including more and being more specific. Marilyn will consider additional elements, and return it to this committee for further review.

5. Sampling Options:

Some agencies would like to be able to use the Data Warehouse or Case Directory search function, to select various elements to better target the cases they think are error prone. For example, one sample based on worker/earned income/ at application or review, so only cases that meet all those criteria would be selected. Milwaukee would also like to include unit. The state was planning more on a sample selected by the state that has all defined time periods and elements, so that the results from all agencies could be statistically valid. That makes the information more helpful to the state in strategizing for statewide issues, directions to go. No conclusion on this was made.

6. Future Agenda Items:

- Second Party Review Form (Lisa)
- MEQC- Contract Language

7: Next Meeting: Monday April 26th

8. Notetaker: Pam Lohaus